



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

people, high and low, have for a full generation regarded the United States with high admiration and gratitude. I have found this sentiment in barber shops and country stores, among students, merchants, and day laborers, cropping out in many ways, as well as officially expressed in various ways by representatives of the government and loudly proclaimed by leading editors. It is true that during the last few years Japanese have been repeatedly hurt by the suspicions and slanders freely expressed in some American papers and by the widespread and continuous rumor that she is planning for war with the United States. This flood of anti-Japanese suspicions and war talk we have reason to believe is in no small part due to the many disappointed war correspondents who failed to get to the front at the time of the Russo-Japanese war. Then, too, many Japanese citizens have received personal treatment which has wounded their feelings deeply. California's treatment of Japanese in the question of education and in proposed unfavorable legislation has been a source of no little dissatisfaction to patriotic Japanese. Would not Americans have had the same feelings had they been placed in Japan's position? As a consequence of these forces it can hardly be doubted that the warmth of Japan's admiration for and gratitude to the United States has considerably abated, but that it has gone to the extent of "antipathy" is, to me, absolutely incredible—another of those slanderous statements that serves to beget the feeling it condemns. I believe that it is as false to say that Japan intends to fight the United States as to say that the United States intends to fight Japan. That either should be the aggressor is inconceivable.

Hymn of Peace.

By John Haynes Holmes.

God of the nations, near and far,
Ruler of all mankind,
Bless Thou Thy people as they strive
The paths of peace to find.

The clash of arms still shakes the sky,
King battles still with king—
Wild through the frightened air of night
The bloody tocsins ring.

But clearer far the friendly speech
Of scientists and seers,
The wise debate of statesmen and
The shouts of pioneers.

And stronger far the clasped hands
Of labor's teeming throngs,
Who in a hundred tongues repeat
Their common creeds and songs.

From shore to shore the peoples call
In loud and sweet acclaim,
The gloom of land and sea is lit
With Pentecostal flame.

O Father! from the curse of war
We pray Thee give release,
And speed, O speed the blessed day
Of justice, love, and peace.

Tune, *St. Agnes.*

Is War Inevitable?

By David Jayne Hill, former Ambassador to Germany.

From his recent book, "World Organization and the Modern State."

It is constantly assumed that the conflicting interests of great powers are in some mysterious way bearing them on to some awful catastrophe for which the nations must prepare. It has been recently said, and by high authority, "The weak man cannot trust his judge, and the dream of the peace advocate is nothing but a dream."

Whom, then, shall the "weak man" trust? Shall he trust the strong man rather than the just judge? But whom shall the strong man trust? Shall he trust no one but himself? What, then, is to become of the State? How, upon this theory, shall the State demand of the strong man, as well as the weak man, obedience to its laws? It is time to realize that dependence upon force, without regard to law and justice, implies a return to anarchy and the subversion of the State. The refusal of the State to be just, because it is strong, would be a repudiation of the principles upon which its authority is founded.

But why is the aspiration of the "peace advocate" declared to be "nothing but a dream"? Is it true that peace is only a dream and war the reality? Do not the periods of peace exceed in duration the periods of war? Which, then, is the dream, and which the reality? When it is considered that the price of a single battleship has never yet been expended by all the nations of the earth combined for the judicial organization of peace, is it not at least premature to say that further progress in this direction is impossible?

Who, then, is prepared to maintain the inevitability of war among really civilized nations? How many times have the prophets of evil cried out in their nightmare, "There will be war," and yet the crisis has passed, the misunderstanding has been cleared up, the rightful concession has been made, and there has been no war. And what proof is there that war between civilized States is inevitable? Is it not better to avoid dogmatism and confine ourselves to the discussion of admitted facts?

This much, at least, is certain—that it lies within the power of the great juristic States to determine the question of war and peace; and it may be said with equal certainty that there is no great power which desires to engage in war with any other. The chief real danger lies in preparing the minds of men for war rather than for peace. There are many purely private interests that promote the belief that war is inevitable and that nations must prepare for it; but, regarded from the point of view of public interest, this belief that war is inevitable has very frail support. In the days of widespread superstition, it was easy to make men believe that human destinies were determined by mysterious powers over which the intelligence of man had no control; but the time has gone by when the convictions of civilized nations can be influenced by such beliefs. There are in the world today no demonstrable rights or interests as between well-organized modern States which may not be adjusted without bloodshed, and it would be difficult to point out any advantage that could be gained by any one of them over the others that

would compensate for the losses of life and money that would be occasioned by war between them. Their one common enemy has been already pointed out and branded. His name is Mutual Distrust. He cannot be overcome by quick-firing guns, or aeroplanes charged with explosives, or fleets of battleships. There is but one champion able to destroy him. In the right hand is the uplifted sword, but it is broken; in the other trembles the balance which has not been tried. Yet it is before this august presence of justice that the nations must learn their destiny.

Why Not Neutralize the Dependent States of the Turkish Empire?

By Erving Winslow.

The shock of arms has rudely reminded us of the existence of conditions which may render nugatory the treaties of peace and courts of arbitration (until the millennial period, when lion and lamb shall lie down together and treaties of any kind become superfluous), unless some sort of international naval police should be created to enforce unacceptable decrees.

Of course, no one but Mr. Roosevelt would cast any slur upon the splendid efforts which are being made to establish the name of peace as a watchword and the idea of peace as a true popular conception, nor upon the work of any of the organizations—Mr. Carnegie's, Mr. Ginn's, the Interparliamentary Union and all the peace societies which are carrying on the movement. Disturbances of the peace of the world are not likely to arise directly among the great powers, the correspondents in the proposed negotiations, but from disputes concerning the disposition of the weaker peoples and their lands, in pursuance of the aggressive land hunger which impels the larger nations to make all sorts of claims to "protectorates" and "spheres of influence" or to show their determination without any claim at all to seize upon territory inhabited by more or less defenseless inhabitants, "grab" in every case being the underlying intention and the obvious end. Herein is, of course, the field for fatal jealousies, for quarrels and rival claims, and for the outbreaks in which the dogs of war struggle over the tempting bone. To turn this jealousy to account so that all may agree to isolate that which all are agreed should not come into the possession of any one government, so that this jealousy may work for good and not for evil, is a practical use of the actual conditions of humanity short of its perfectibility and plucking the flower Safety from the nettle Danger.

The doctrine of neutralization is by no means new, and it has been tested by use. The illustrious Whewell long ago made his notable declaration that the safety of the world lay in making neutrality "the true road to a perpetual peace." (The writer has discussed the subject in an address before the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress, October 6, 1904; in the *North American Review*, September, 1907; the *American Journal of International Law*, April, 1908, and the *Peacemaker*, April, 1911. See also statement by Mr. Moorfield Storey at the hearing before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, April 6, 1906.)

There is a vital distinction, which must by no means

be overlooked, between the protection of one or two powers and universal neutralization by the consent of all. No nation ever had a more magnificent opportunity for giving an example in neutralization than the United States, upon which it is unnecessary now to dwell. Instead of taking advantage of this opportunity, the President of a country which has kept "enfranchised" Cuba tied to it by a string, which has set up a protectorate in Santo Domingo and Liberia, is now earnestly urging, as titular "peace treaties," conventions with Honduras and Venezuela, the mere suggestion of which is already creating a strong South American union to resist the "tyranny of the aggression of the United States"! Not a movement for peace, but a most distinct menace of war, like so many of the measures promoted by the President, such as the increase of the navy, the fortification of the Panama Canal, and that movement of troops to the borders of Mexico, the result of which might have been so tremendous. There could no doubt be many Sir Robert Harts found without representing a foreign sovereign to assist these neutralized countries in the conduct of their affairs and in the evolution of good government, and the ordinary influences of intercourse of civilized nations and commercial exchanges would have their legitimate effect. The creation of autonomy will never be reached, as John Fiske said in all history it had not been reached, by the tutelage of a foreign sovereign.

Without going into detail, the suggestion may be hazarded that some of the dependent states of the Turkish Empire are suitable subjects for neutralization. It is probable that Egypt is so, and the same may be said of Crete. The matter is worthy of consideration, though it has not the attractions of the direct ethical appeal to sentiment of the peace propaganda.

The Chicago Office and Field Secretaryship.

By Charles E. Beals, Field Secretary.

President Taft was the guest of the Chicago Association of Commerce on Saturday evening, October 28. At the great banquet given in his honor the President spoke on "International Arbitration and Peace."

Minor activities, like the circulation of copies of the Mohonk report, the distribution of the literature of the International Conciliation Association, and the furnishing of material to assist in the preparation of addresses and essays, have gone on in connection with other work. Material has been sent to the New York *World* and Chicago *News* almanacs for publication in the 1911 edition.

The Field Secretary was the guest of the Chicago Political Equality League on Saturday afternoon, October 7, speaking on "The Widening of Citizenship." Mrs. George W. Trout is the president of this influential organization which has doubled its membership during the past year.

The traveling secretary visited the Ecumenical Methodist Conference at Toronto. This was the fourth world gathering of representatives of all branches of Methodism and Wesleyanism. Sessions are held every ten years. Delegates were in attendance from all parts of the earth. The conference devoted a special session